UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/759,443	01/15/2004	Ping H. Kui	17646-113001 / 20000246	7836

26231 7590 12/12/2006

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER	
PITARO, RYAN F	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/759,443	KUI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ryan F. Pitaro	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 September 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-36 have been examined.

Response to Amendment

2. This action is in response to Amendment B filed 9/18/2006. In the amendment claims 1-36 were amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,2,4,5,9-13,15-16,20-24,26-27,31-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boulter ("Boulter", US 6,771,288) in view of Ishii ("Ishii", US2003/0065814) in view of Mulvey ("Mulvey", US 6,968,363).

As per independent claim 1, Boulter teaches a method for administering bridge ports for a network, comprising: retrieving information associated with a plurality of switches, the information including at least identifiers of bridging ports of the switches

and statuses of the bridging ports (Figure 3 and Figure 4, column 5 lines 14-19); receiving through the interactive display updates to at least one propagation status of at least one of the bridging ports of at least one of the switches (Column 8 lines 53-58, Column 7 lines 20-35); and changing the at least one propagation status based on the updates (Figure 3 and Figure 4, column 5 lines 14-19). However, Boulter does not expressly teach displaying the plurality of switches through its interactive display. Ishii teaches displaying the information for the plurality of switches ([0057] lines 1-6). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include the switch information of Ishii with the interactive display of Boulter. Motivation to do so would have been to provide improved communication quality allowing the user more detailed information about the ports and switches. Boulter-Ishii fails to distinctly point out displaying the changed propagation status. However, Mulvey teaches displaying the at least one changed propagation status through the interactive display (Figure 3). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Mulvey with the method of Boulter-Ishii. Motivation to do so would have been to convey all relevant information to the user in an updated fashion.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Boulter-Ishii-Mulvey teaches a method wherein displaying the information through an interactive display comprises displaying all the retrieved identifiers of the bridging ports on a single window (Boulter, Figure 3).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Boulter-Ishii-Mulvey teaches a

method, wherein the information associated with the switches further comprising a switch type (Ishii, [0052] lines [55]).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Boulter-Ishii-Mulvey teaches a method

wherein displaying the information comprises color-coding status of the bridging ports (Boulter Column 8 lines 10-16).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Boulter-Ishii-Mulvey teaches a method wherein the interactive display operable to allow a user to change the propagation status of a plurality of all ports of a single switch, a plurality of ports of a single switch, and a plurality of ports of multiple switches (Boulter, Figure 4).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 9, Boulter-Ishii-Mulvey teaches a method wherein the interactive display operable to allow a user to change the propagation comprises the interactive display operable to allow a user to change the propagation status from a single window (Boulter, Figure 4).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, Boulter-Ishii-Mulvey teaches a method wherein the interactive display operable to allow a user to change the propagation status of all ports of a single switch, a plurality of ports of a single switch, and all ports of multiple switches (Boulter, Figure 4).

Claims 12,23,34 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 1, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale. With the exception of Boulter further teaching the software being operable to display propagation statuses of the bridge ports and

wherein propagation status includes an indication of whether or not a bridge port should be polled to obtain its current status (Column 7 lines 20-67 and Column 8 lines 35-58) and Ishii further teaching each switch of the plurality of switches including one or more bridge ports including the bridge ports of each switch (Figure 18).

Claims 13,24 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 2, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 15,26 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 4, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 16,27 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 5, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 20,31 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 9, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 21,32 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 10, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 22,33 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 11, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 35, Boulter-Ishii-Mulvey teaches a method wherein propagation status includes an indication of whether or not a bridging port should be polled for its current status (Boulter, Column 7 lines 20-67 and Column 8 lines 35-58).

As per claim 36, Boulter-Ishii-Mulvey teaches software, wherein the information associated with the plurality of switches further includes at least the hierarchical relationships of the plurality of switches (Boulter, Figure 4), wherein display of the

information for the plurality of switches further includes display of a hierarchical representation of the plurality of switches derived from the hierarchical relationships (Boulter, Figure 4) and wherein a representation of a switch on the hierarchical representation includes an indication of the propagation status of all bridge ports associated with the switch, wherein the indication includes a first indication when all associated bridge ports are propagating, a second indication when no associated bridge ports are propagating, and a third indication when some of the associated bridge ports are propagating (Boulter, Column 12 lines 30-65).

3. Claim 3,6,7,8,14,17,18,19,25,28,29,30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boulter ("Boulter", US 6,771,288) and of Ishii ("Ishii", US2003/0065814) and Mulvey ("Mulvey", US 6,968,363) in view of Kekic et al ("Kekic", US 5,999,179).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Boulter-Ishii-Mulvey teaches bridging ports, but fails to teach a hierarchical tree structure featuring network ports. However, Kekic teaches all identifiers in a hierarchical tree structure (Figure 3B). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the hierarchical tree of Kekic with the interactive display of Boulter-Ishii.

Motivation to do so would have been to show an organized way of displaying related elements.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Boulter-Ishii-Mulvey-Kekic teaches a method wherein the interactive display comprising a first and a second window, the first window comprising a hierarchical tree structure of all managed switches (Kekic, Figure 3B, item 305), the second window comprising a tabular display of port information of a managed switch selected in the hierarchical tree structure (Kekic, status window).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Boulter-Ishii-Mulvey -Kekic teaches a method wherein the second window provides a field in which a user of the interactive display can view the propagation status of a plurality of ports of the managed switch selected in the hierarchical tree structure (Boulter, Figure 4).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Boulter-Ishii-Mulvey -Kekic teaches a method wherein the propagation status of any or all ports of the managed switch selected in the hierarchical tree structure (Boulter, Figure 4).

Claims 14,25 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 3, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 17,28 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 6, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 18,29 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 7, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 19,30 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 8, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F. Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Mondays through Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2174

RFP

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100